

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-15 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 3 and 4 have been amended. No new claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. As a result, claims 1, 3-10, and 12-15 remain pending for examination, with claims 1 and 9 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-10, and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,925,631 (Golden), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,533 (Vosburgh), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,096,224 (Murthy) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,567 (Girardot). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Overview of Embodiments of the Invention

Before discussing the claims, Applicant provides a brief overview of some embodiments of the invention to assist the Examiner in appreciating various aspects of the present invention. Some embodiments are directed to parsing XML data using an automatically generated parsing state machine, avoiding the need for the user to construct their own state machine (§ 11). The parsing state machine is generated using a parsing map which maps XML elements to user-written parsing functions (§ 24-26). During parsing, a parsing agent handles events related to the XML elements in accordance with the generated parsing state machine, verifying the structure and consistency of the XML elements (§ 26). The agent extracts any attributes and content associated with an XML element and returns the attributes and content to the user-written parsing functions identified in the parsing map (§ 26).

It should be appreciated that the foregoing discussion of embodiments of the invention is provided merely to assist the Examiner in appreciating various aspects of the present invention. However, not all of the description provided above necessarily applies to each of the independent claims pending in the application. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to not rely upon the foregoing summary in interpreting any of the claims or in determining whether they patentably

distinguish over the prior art of record, but rather is requested to rely only upon the language of the claims themselves and the arguments specifically related thereto provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a method for facilitating parsing XML data. Claim 1 recites “creating a parser to pre-parse XML source data, the parser including a parsing agent, the parsing agent automatically generating a parsing state machine in accordance with the XML element names defined in the parsing map.”

None of prior art references of record teach “the parser including a parsing agent, the parsing agent *automatically generating a parsing state machine.*” The Office Action concedes that Golden and Murthy do not show generating a parsing state machine. However, the Office Action asserts Girardot discloses this feature. It does not. The passage of Girardot cited by the Office Action (col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 8), describes the state machine shown in FIG. 1A. The state machine is used by a parser reading an XML document. The passage describes the states of the state machine and when transitions of the state machine are made. Girardot merely presents a specific, fixed, parser state machine used for reading an XML document. In contrast, the claim language requires “*generating a parsing state machine.*” Girardot does not teach or suggest anything about how the state machine is generated, and certainly does not teach or suggest “generating a parsing state machine *in accordance with the XML element names defined in the parsing map.*”

Even if one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Girardot, Murthy, Vosburgh, and Golden, the combination would not have yielded the claimed invention. None of prior art references of record, alone or in combination, teach or suggest “creating a parser to pre-parse XML source data, the parser including a parsing agent, the parsing agent automatically generating a parsing state machine in accordance with the XML element names defined in the parsing map.”

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1 patentable distinguishes over the prior art of record, such that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Claims 3-8 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, it is believed to be unnecessary to discuss the further distinguishing features of the dependent claims, but the Applicants reserve the right to do so in the future.

Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 is directed to a computer system for parsing XML data. Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, “a parsing agent, the parsing agent automatically generating a parsing state machine in accordance with the XML element names defined in the parsing map.”

This limitation clearly distinguishes over the cited references. The Office Action does not address this specific limitation. However, it should be clear from the discussion above related to claim 1 that Girardot fails to satisfy this limitation of claim 9.

Thus, even if one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Girardot, Murthy, Vosburgh, and Golden, the combination would not have yielded the claimed invention. None of prior art references of record, alone or in combination, teach or suggest “creating a parser to pre-parse XML source data, the parser including a parsing agent, the parsing agent automatically generating a parsing state machine in accordance with the XML element names defined in the parsing map.”

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that claim 9 is patentable and distinguishes over the prior art of record, such that the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn. Claims 10 and 12-15 depend from claim 9 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, it is believed to be unnecessary to discuss the further distinguishing features of the dependent claims, but the Applicants reserve the right to do so in the future.


CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. M1103.70546US00.

Dated: October 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Richard F. Giunta
Registration No.: 36,149
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000

x10/31/08x